

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Toni J. Church,

Plaintiff

v.

Nevada Department Correctional Center, et.  
al.,

Defendants

Case No. 2:24-cv-02319-JAD-DJA

**Order Dismissing  
and Closing Case**

Plaintiff Toni J. Church brings this civil-rights lawsuit to redress constitutional violations that she claims she suffered while incarcerated at Florence McClure Women's Correctional Center. According to the Nevada Department of Corrections' inmate database, Church is no longer in custody. On May 8, 2025, this court ordered plaintiff to file her updated address by June 9, 2025.<sup>1</sup> That deadline passed, and plaintiff did not file an updated address or otherwise respond to the court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case.<sup>2</sup> A court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules.<sup>3</sup> In determining whether to dismiss an action on this ground, the court must consider: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its

---

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

<sup>3</sup> *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of  
2 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.<sup>4</sup>

3 The first two factors, the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the  
4 court’s interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of the plaintiff’s claims. The  
5 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a  
6 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an  
7 action.<sup>5</sup> The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is  
8 greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

9 The fifth factor requires the court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used  
10 to correct the party’s failure that brought about the court’s need to consider dismissal.<sup>6</sup> Courts  
11 “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but must  
12 explore possible and meaningful alternatives.”<sup>7</sup> Because this action cannot realistically proceed  
13 without the ability for the court and the defendants to send plaintiff case-related documents,  
14 filings, and orders, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting another deadline. But  
15 without an updated address, the likelihood that the second order would even reach the plaintiff is  
16 low, so issuing a second order will only delay the inevitable and further squander the court’s

---

18 <sup>4</sup> *In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting  
19 *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)).

20 <sup>5</sup> *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

21 <sup>6</sup> *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less  
22 drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor);  
23 *accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the  
persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic  
alternatives prior to disobedience of the court’s order as satisfying this element[.]” i.e., like the  
“initial granting of leave to amend coupled with the warning of dismissal for failure to  
comply[.]” have been “eroded” by *Yourish*).

<sup>7</sup> *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

1 finite resources. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these  
2 circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

3 Having thoroughly weighed these dismissal factors, I find that they weigh in favor of  
4 dismissal. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **THIS ACTION IS DISMISSED** without  
5 prejudice based on the plaintiff's failure to file her updated address in compliance with the  
6 court's order, and Church's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [ECF No. 1] is **DENIED**  
7 without prejudice as moot. The Clerk of Court is directed to **ENTER JUDGMENT** accordingly  
8 and **CLOSE THIS CASE**. If Toni J. Church wishes to pursue her claims, she must file a  
9 complaint in a new case.

10 Dated: June 26, 2025

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey